

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 21, 2009, and the telephonic interview conducted with the Examiner on June 10, 2009. The following remarks are supplemental to those made in the Amendment filed on May 20, 2009.

Claims 1-19, 21, 28, 29, and 32-35 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 21 are in independent form. Claims 20 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 4, 12, 13, 17-19, 21, 28, and 29 have been amended to define aspects of Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 2, 9, 13, 19, and 21 are objected to because the limitation "extracting a content description depending on the abstract constraints associated with the multimedia document" is ambiguous. In response, Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 21, as deemed necessary, with special attention to the points raised in section 8 of the Office Action. More particularly, Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 21 have been amended to recite "wherein characteristics of the extracted content description correspond to the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document," which Applicant respectfully submits is not ambiguous. It is believed that the objections to the claims have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a document entitled "Web Services Description Language (WSDL) V1.2" (*Chinnici et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0051216 (*Hsu et al.*), and further in view of a document entitled "An Overview of the MPEG-7 Description

Definition Language (DDL) Proposals" (*Hunter et al.*); that Claims 12, 19, 20, and 29 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chinnici et al.* in view of *Hsu et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028559 (*Moreau*) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117798 (*Newman et al.*); that Claims 13, 21, 22, and 28 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreau* in view of *Hsu et al.*, and further in view of *Chinnici et al.*; that Claims 14-18 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreau*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Chinnici et al.* in view of *Hunter et al.*; that Claims 32-34 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chinnici et al.*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Hunter et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205573 (*Carlson et al.*); and that Claim 35 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreau*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Chinnici et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0031260 (*Tabatabai et al.*). Cancellation of Claims 20 and 22 renders their rejections moot. For at least the following reasons, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 21, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium storing control logic for causing a computer to implement a method of offering a service, described in a service description document, in a communication network. The method includes: (1) extracting, from the service description document, a first abstract part, (2) extracting, from the service description document, a second concrete part, (3) extracting, from the binary multimedia document, a content description of the binary multimedia document, (4) comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document, and (5) transmitting an error message, if the content description does not satisfy the abstract constraints. The first abstract part is adapted to describe

at least one message exchanged over the communication network when the service is performed. The first abstract part includes a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document. The second concrete part is adapted to describe information relating to transmission of the messages over the communication network. Characteristics of the extracted content description correspond to the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document.

Notable features of Claim 1 are that the content description of the binary multimedia document is extracted from the binary multimedia document and that characteristics of the extracted content description correspond to the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document. That is, the content description includes characteristics describing contents of the binary multimedia document, wherein the particular content description characteristics extracted from the binary multimedia document correspond to the abstract constraints that have been extracted from the service description document. By virtue of these features, a tool can be provided that takes as inputs a binary multimedia document and an MPEG-7 document, and validates the binary multimedia document based on abstract constraints included in the MPEG-7 document, for example.¹ That is, a binary multimedia document, which includes an MPEG-7 description, and a WSDL document can be provided, wherein the MPEG-7 description includes a description of abstract constraints having the same characteristics as the abstract constraints identified in the WSDL document so that such characteristics can be compared to validate the binary multimedia document.

For a given binary multimedia document, the specification discusses two ways in which these features can be implemented (*see FIG. 1 and page 20, line 27, to page 22, line 5*). In

¹ Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

the first case, the binary multimedia document contains an associated MPEG-7 description. In this case, it is necessary to extract from the MPEG-7 description only the characteristics (*i.e.*, descriptors) corresponding to the abstract constraints in a service description document. If not all required descriptors are present in the MPEG-7 description, missing descriptors can be added to the MPEG-7 description. In the second case, the binary multimedia document does not have an associated MPEG-7 description. In this case, characteristics corresponding to the abstract constraints can be determined from the binary multimedia document itself. For example, if the binary multimedia document includes a digital image and the abstract constraints in the service description document include “height” and “width,” the actual height and width of the digital image, which typically are specified in a header of the digital image, can be extracted from the binary multimedia document.

Chinnici et al. is understood to relate to a model for describing web services (*see Abstract*). *Chinnici et al.* discusses that, when an Extensible Markup Language (XML) Schema is used, a symbol space may exist for key constraints (*see paragraph 32, section 2.13*). *Chinnici et al.* also discusses that a Web Services Description Language (WSDL) may be used with other description languages to describe message parts and their constraints (*see paragraph 36, section 3.2*). Nothing has been found in *Chinnici et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest that constraints are associated with a *binary* multimedia document, much less that particular constraints, which correspond to constraints that have been extracted from a service description document, are extracted from a *binary* multimedia document.

Hsu et al. is understood to relate to a system for automatic validation of multimedia product manuals (*see paragraph 2*). Apparently, *Hsu et al.* teaches that a Product Document Constraint Specification Language (PDCSL) is provided to represent various types of

documentation guidelines as document constraints that are enforced within documents (*see* paragraph 5). Each document constraint identifies a set of document objects, and specifies a logical expression that is to be evaluated for each instance of the document objects (*see* paragraph 5). A Document Constraint Analyzer takes as input a set of document files and a document constraint specification file, extracts and examines information associated with the document objects, and evaluates the logical expressions specified in the document constraints (*see* paragraph 5). Nothing has been found in *Hsu et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest that particular constraints, which correspond to constraints that have been extracted from a service description document, are extracted from a *binary* multimedia document.

Hunter et al. is understood to relate to proposals for an MPEG-7 document Description Definition Language (DDL) (*see* Abstract). Nothing has been found in *Hunter et al.* that is believed to remedy the deficiencies of *Chinnici et al.* and *Hsu et al.* identified above.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that a combination of *Chinnici et al.*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Hunter et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest a method that includes “extracting, from the binary multimedia document, a content description of the binary multimedia document,” and “wherein characteristics of the extracted content description correspond to the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document,” as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over *Chinnici et al.*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Hunter et al.*, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

A review of the other prior art of record, including *Moreau, Newman et al.*, *Carlson et al.*, and *Tabatabai et al.*, has failed to reveal anything that is believed to cure the deficiencies of *Chinnici et al.*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Hunter et al.* identified above.

Independent Claims 12, 13, 19, and 21 include one or more features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 21 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/

Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200